

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
BEAUMONT DIVISION**

**BIJU MAKRUKKATTU JOSEPH, *et al.***

§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**v.**

**1:13-CV-324**

**SIGNAL INTERNATIONAL L.L.C.,  
*et al.***

**ORDER DENYING THE PARTIES' OBJECTIONS TO THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S  
MEMORANDUM AND ORDER ON SIGNAL'S MOTION TO COMPEL**

Pending before the court are the Plaintiffs' "Motion for Reconsideration of Signal's Motion to Compel and Objection to Magistrate Judge's Memorandum and Order" (Doc. No. 172) and Signal's "Objection to Magistrate Judge's Memorandum and Order." (Doc. No. 188.) The Plaintiffs seek to have the magistrate judge's order set aside, and alternatively, request that the court clarify the order. Signal merely requests a clarification as to the relevant period of discovery.

The district judge must consider timely objections to a magistrate judge's order responding to a non-dispositive motion, and modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. FED. R. CIV. P. 72. After considering the arguments of the parties and the applicable law, the court finds that the magistrate judge's order is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. The magistrate judge gave appropriate weight to the fact that the T-visa affidavits have already been produced. The production of these affidavits does not extinguish the Plaintiffs' obligation to produce other relevant and discoverable information in the T-visa applications and visas themselves. The Plaintiffs have also failed to concretely show, at this juncture of the litigation, that Signal will use this information for an improper purpose. Accordingly, the court will not set aside the magistrate judge's order.

To the extent that both parties want clarification of Judge Hawthorn's order, that should be directed to Judge Hawthorn, but only after the parties have strictly complied with the Meet and Confer requirements set forth in the Local Rules of the Eastern District. After reviewing the parties' arguments, the court is confident that these issues could—and should—be resolved amicably without court intervention, and avoid micromanagement of the discovery process.

Accordingly, the Plaintiffs "Motion for Reconsideration of Signal's Motion to Compel and Objection to Magistrate Judge's Memorandum and Order" (Doc. No. 172), and Signal's "Objection to Magistrate Judge's Memorandum and Order (Doc. No. 188) are **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **24** day of **February, 2015**.



---

Ron Clark, United States District Judge